

# THE *Dan Smoot Report*



DAN SMOOT

Vol. 4, Number 46

Monday, November 17, 1958

Dallas, Texas

## POLICE STATE

In the general elections, November 4, 1958, union bosses of America won control of both houses of the National Congress. The new Senate will have 54 members endorsed by AFL-CIO as "friendly" to the big unions. That would give the unions control of a majority of the Senate, even if the remaining 42 senators were openly "unfriendly" to unions. The fact is that of the 42 senators whom AFL-CIO bosses did not endorse as "friendly" only about 12 have the courage to fight against socialistic legislation demanded by unions.

The House in the new 86th Congress will contain at least 220 members who were endorsed by AFL-CIO bosses as "friends." That will give unions control of the House.

Before the election returns were all in, union officials were telling how they plan to use their political power.

On November 5, 1958, an Associated Press story, datelined Washington, said:

*Labor unions today acclaimed the election returns as insuring a Congress that can wreck all existing state right-to-work laws at one swoop and enact new social legislation....*

*Union strategists said the complexion of the new Congress is such that labor-wanted measures — like higher minimum wages, extra jobless benefits and recession curatives — will get more favorable consideration than they have in recent years.*

*One thing organized labor will fight for in Congress next year, union sources said, is repeal of that section of the Taft-Hartley law known as 14B which permits states to enact right-to-work laws. These ban the union shop — a labor contract provision that requires workers to join a union to hold their jobs.*

*Kansas voters approved a ban on the union shop Tuesday, joining 18 other states which already had such laws on the books..*

*But right-to-work was voted down handily in Ohio, California, Washington, and Colorado, and lost by a narrow margin in Idaho.*

A United Press International story, datelined Washington, November 5, 1958, said:

*Leaders of organized labor met today to translate their election victory into a legislative program....*

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT, a magazine edited and published weekly by Dan Smoot, mailing address: P. O. Box 9611, Lakewood Station, Dallas 14, Texas, Telephone TAylor 4-8683 (Office Address 6441 Gaston Avenue). Subscription rates: \$10.00 a year, \$6.00 for 6 months, \$3.00 for 3 months, \$18.00 for two years. For first class mail \$12.00 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) \$14.00 a year. Reprints of specific issues: 1 copy for 25¢; 6 for \$1.00; 50 for \$5.50; 100 for \$10.00—each price for bulk mailing to one person.

*(They) interpreted the election returns as a "mandate" to Congress to halt rising living costs... and enact other programs advocated by the big labor unions.*

In mentioning "rising living costs," the unions refer to the number one threat to our economy, inflation; but it is union-supported programs of the federal government which cause inflation: (1) foreign aid, which pours federal tax money into our economy, thus adding to the cost of all goods and services, while taking out of our economy goods that are given away abroad; (2) deficit financing, which results from such enormous federal expenditures required by union-supported programs that even the monstrous federal tax-take is not enough to pay for all of it; (3) continuous wage raises in key industries, which have no relation to increased production and which are enforced by big unions through the monopoly power given them in federal laws.

Thus, the union program for America for the next two years is runaway inflation, coupled with a final realization of socialist labor dictatorship in this once free republic.

The issue is clearly drawn. Americans who cherish freedom will either fight with dogged determination between now and the first Tuesday in November, 1960; or, the remnants of our American constitutional system will be destroyed.

If Americans who love freedom would fight as hard and continuously as the other crowd does, they could save their republic.

Roscoe Drummond, nationally syndicated columnist for the *New York Herald Tribune* said, in his column of November 7, 1958:

*The over-riding political fact is that the Republican Right-wing was decimated.*

*Wherever the Republicans lost, it was almost uni-*

*formly the extreme Republican conservatives who fell by the wayside.*

*Wherever the Republicans won, it was almost invariably the Republican liberals, the Eisenhower Republicans, the 'modern' Republicans.*

That comment deserves a prize — booby, that is.

But, then, others who are infinitely more sensible and reliable than Roscoe Drummond would get the same prize.

U. S. *News & World Report*, in the November 14, 1958, issue said:

*The tide was against Republican "conservatives." Senators Knowland, Malone, Bricker, Watkins, Barrett, Revercomb, Payne, and Hoblitzell — all "conservatives" — were defeated.*

The 1958 elections, as I understand them, were a repudiation of modern republicanism, rather than an endorsement of the Democrat party.

On June 16, 1958, in this *Report*, I said:

*It is difficult for a constitutionalist and patriot to be elected in the kind of welfare state which new dealism, fair dealism, and modern republicanism have built in the United States.*

*A constitutional patriot cannot promise anyone anything that is to be paid for by someone else. His political opponents can promise to raid the public treasury for handouts to everyone.*

*Liberals can promise businessmen and chamber-of-commerce boosters federal money for their municipal airport; federal money for "urban renewal"; federal money for streets and roads; federal money for public works.*

*Liberals can promise unions that the Davis-Bacon wage-fixing procedures will be written into all federal contracts; that none of the unions' special privileges will be taken away; that collective bargaining under union monopoly will continue as national policy.*

*Liberals can promise greater benefits for the unemployed; bigger pensions for the aged; socialize*

medicine for the ill; easier federal loans for real estate dealers; bigger subsidies for the airlines; greater handouts for the farmers; more foreign-aid contracts for big industries; bigger tax write-offs for some; and special tax-exemptions for others.

A constitutional patriot can promise none of these blessings, to be paid for with money taken away from someone else.

A constitutional patriot could make the finest promise of all: he could promise to get the tax collectors hands out of our pockets and the bureaucrats off our backs, so that we could keep our God-given freedom, and enough of our own money, to work out our own problems.

But it's hard for a man like that to get on a ballot anywhere in the United States. Both major parties have prostituted themselves to expediency and have become actual enemies of American constitutional government.

Some of the good conservatives who manage to get elected under the label of one of the major parties seem to lose something important in the process.

These are the Senators and Congressmen who tell their friends privately that the Truman-Eisenhower foreign policy was dictated by an invisible, international cabal determined to force America into world government; that our Social Security system is bankrupt; that the committees of big businessmen, who make world tours to study our foreign aid program and then help sell them to American taxpayers, are motivated by the government contracts which foreign aid gives them; that inflation of the American dollar is a deliberate policy of government, designed to dull, like a narcotic, the pains of big-government taxing and spending; that the leadership of Congress answers to the whip of Walter Reuther.

But many of the Senators and Congressmen who say these things privately will never say them publicly: they don't want to be branded as extremists and crackpots. . . .

Most of the conservative-at-heart moderates in Congress have moderated themselves into impotence: to wit — Joe Martin, Republican leader in the House. Some of them have even gone over to the left side: to wit — Everett Dirksen, Republican Senator from Illinois.

Do you remember a time when "Bricker Amendment" was a phrase which could have elected someone President of the United States? It didn't, because it got moderated. . . .

You cannot sound an alarm to awaken a sleeping nation with soft inoffensive words of moderation. You cannot beat a rattlesnake to death with a toothpick. You cannot rope a steer with a silken thread. You cannot kill an elephant with a fly-swatter. You cannot turn back the socialist revolution with middle-of-the-road, stop-gap legislation.

For one thing, you cannot get fighting, determined public support for half-hearted measures. The people are not nearly as dumb as Harry Hopkins said they are. They won't exert themselves to support something which they know won't do any good. They'd rather continue voting for federal handouts, in the hope that they can grease their own palms.

But give them a change to fight for the unadulterated principles which Jefferson and Madison wrote into our great organic documents of government, and they will fight: they will fight to win.

If the Congressmen and Senators who know that our nation is sliding into ruin . . . would stop puttering around trying to reduce spending which should be stopped altogether; would stop trying to eliminate some of the worst features of a foreign policy that should be scrapped outright; would stop trying to limit welfare legislation that has no constitutional authorization in any form — and would concentrate on an uncompromising, all-out piece of legislation to cut the heart out of the one-world socialist drive in America, I believe they would receive vigorous, massive public support.

Once the movement started, millions of timid and moderate people would join the . . . all-or-nothing fight for genuine American constitutional government.

The all-or-nothing, uncompromising piece of legislation I have in mind is House Joint Resolution 355, proposing a constitutional amendment to repeal the income tax amendment and compel the federal government to get out of all unconstitutional activities.

Why have American farmers rejected the farm program of Ezra Taft Benson, who comes closer to being a conservative constitutionalist



than any other Secretary of Agriculture since 1933? Are our farmers opposed to conservative constitutionalism? I don't think so. I think that, if they had a clear-cut choice between freedom as American farmers used to know it, and the semi-socialized state of American agriculture today, they would vote for freedom.

But the Benson "modern republican" program does not give them that choice. The Benson farm program keeps the bureaucratic controls and subsidies but reduces the size of the subsidy. It makes sense that if farmers must vote for controls-and-subsidies, they'll take the brand that offers the biggest handout.

On October 27, 1958, I said of Senator Knowland:

*In California, conservatives are backing Knowland for governor, because Knowland's campaign is tied to the badly needed Right-to-Work proposition, and because Knowland does talk like a conservative, whereas, his opponent, Edmund Brown, is an outspoken new-deal Democrat. But well-informed California conservatives who have watched Knowland have no enthusiasm for him. They have spent too many years listening to Knowland deliver conservative speeches while making an almost-perfect modern-republican voting record in the Senate.*

Those remarks about Knowland are applicable to Senators Bricker, Watkins, Barrett, Revercomb, Payne, and Hoblitzell; and they explain the defeat of those "conservatives."

The remarks may help explain the defeat of Senator George Malone. I have known and liked George Malone for years and have applauded his stand against the Reciprocal Trade Agreements program, against world government, and against foreign aid. But how did George stand on the other great issues of our day? I do not know. Maybe many of George Malone's constituents did not know either.

In Utah, J. Bracken Lee gave the voters a

chance to vote for a real American constitutionalist; and he polled a big vote; but he could not overcome the million-dollar smear campaign which unions directed against him during the last few days, when he had neither the time nor the financial resources to answer the falsehoods.

The campaign of Bruce Alger in Dallas (for reelection to Congress) is a classic example of how voters, given a reasonable chance to elect a genuine constitutionalist, will elect him.

A Republican in a one-party Democrat state like Texas has an enormous disadvantage. Bruce Alger is a Republican. A politician in Texas who has the militant opposition of Lyndon Johnson and Sam Rayburn has great power against him. Johnson and Rayburn fought Alger with all their influence. A politician in Dallas who does not have the support of both metropolitan newspapers automatically loses many votes. The Dallas Times Herald was against Bruce Alger.

When a genuine conservative in Dallas runs against an opponent who claims to be conservative, he loses many votes from uninformed conservatives. Bruce Alger's opponent, though a thorough-going left-winger, called himself a conservative.

Bruce Alger's opponent received support from the national Democrat Party and from the big unions — and from a considerable portion of the big-business group in Dallas. Alger's support was from the citizens of Dallas county who believe in American constitutional principles; and Bruce Alger won by a margin of about 8,000 votes in a county that has 65,000 union members.

I believe that Americans in practically every other Congressional District in America would

have made a similar choice — if they had had a chance.

They didn't have the chance, because they sat idly for too long, permitting themselves to be out-maneuvered by the organized minorities which will convert this nation into a police state, if Americans who care do not begin to make some determined effort soon.

The following articles indicate, I think, how we are already moving in the direction of a police state.

\* \* \* \* \*

## Union Tactics in Ohio

On September 30, 1958, C. William O'Neill, Governor of Ohio, spoke to the Board of Directors of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce, at Columbus, asking them to support the right-to-work proposition.

The governor said he knew the Chamber of Commerce was in favor of right-to-work but realized that the Chamber had been intimidated by union threats. The governor gave proof that the unions were using the technique of intimidation and force throughout the state, and he predicted that fear of unions would play a major part in defeating right-to-work in Ohio. He was right, and he himself was defeated.

Governor O'Neill said to the Ohio Chamber of Commerce Directors:

*It's very apparent here that there is some intimidation felt by this group that is so strong for it (right-to-work), and a reluctance to give money for fear of the reprisals that may come in individual industries....*

*I made a speech to the Junior Chamber of Commerce... on "Freedom and Liberty and Intimidation," and a half a dozen members came up to me after the meeting.*

*One boy who works in a bank in a big city in Ohio said:*

*"I circulated a petition. The union boss came in to my president, pulled two accounts out of the bank, and said if that's filed we'll advise our members to take their accounts out. The president said to me: 'Don't file the petition, or if you do, resign.' I kept my job and I still have the petition."*

*Another young man came up to me and said:*

*"I'm the executive head of the United Appeals in my community. I signed a petition. The union boss called me up and said, 'If you don't withdraw your name, there will be no labor donations to United Appeals in this community'."*

*A second young man, from a second city, told me the same thing happened to him in United Appeals in his community.*

*A young man who is connected with a bowling alley said he signed a petition, and the union boss pulled every league out of his alley....*

*A woman wrote me a letter from down in Belmont County. She said:*

*"We signed a petition on Right To Work. Our business has been boycotted. Our customers have been boycotted. Our billboards have been torn down. Our neon signs were destroyed. We are bankrupt."*

*"My husband is going to return to Ohio State University, to get a few more hours credit added to his degree, so that he can go into teaching, which we hope will be more rewarding than the business we have been in which has been destroyed because of our efforts to bring an issue before the people of Ohio."*

*In one of the eastern counties in Ohio the union boss has blacklisted the hospital, so that if any union person goes to a hospital, their bill will not be paid out of the funds that were provided for them by the union....*

*We have a great many bosses and goons today who are not hesitating to use the great economic power which they have in their hands to compel little people to be afraid to speak out, even afraid to vote, and certainly afraid to act and work for what they believe in.*

*If they can intimidate bankers and industrialists and businessmen to be afraid to work for what they believe in, what can they do to the small employee in their unions?*

## Tax Club in the South

An October 30, 1958, United Press International news story, datelined Washington, said, in part:

*Churches that open their doors to private school classes in the fight against integration may lose their tax-exempt status, it was learned yesterday.*

*A spokesman for the Internal Revenue Service said the question had 'been raised' and the service had it under active consideration. . . .*

*Approximately 55 churches in Little Rock, Ark., and two Virginia cities are already actively involved or have offered facilities to help in private schooling plans substituting for public schools closed in integration battles.*

*In many instances the churches offered their facilities to help the children during the emergency rather than in an effort to aid the anti-integration fight. However, Internal Revenue officials indicated the effect on the churches' tax-exempt status would be the same regardless of their intent. . . .*

*Church contributions may now be deducted from the contributor's income taxes up to 30 per cent of his gross income. If a church lost its tax-exempt status this deduction would not be allowed, according to the IRS spokesman. This might cut materially into a church's income from contributions.*

*The reason for depriving such churches of tax-exempt status according to IRS officials, would be primarily on the ground that they are engaging in activities other than those for which the status was granted.*

*A church or other institution that lost its tax exemption could reapply after it halted the unacceptable practice and the exemption then probably would be renewed, the expert said. . . .*

*Although many churches operate their own schools, these are tax-exempt by virtue of the church's religious exemption rather than as an educational exemption. IRS experts said it was unlikely churches offering facilities for public school students could qualify for tax exemption as educational institutions. If this were sought, the IRS would have to consider whether the church was helping to evade the Supreme Court's integration edict, the officials said.*

This is police-state tactics in their most naked form: using taxing power to force compliance with political programs of a ruling clique.

## Tax Club in the Mid-West

On October 9, 1958, Robert J. Drake had a by-line article in the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, which said:

*It was roundup time for taxes yesterday with the seizure by federal tax agents of 27 horses owned by Amish farmers in four northern Ohio counties. Also impounded was one cow.*

*The animals were ordered 'distrained' by the Internal Revenue Service to satisfy delinquent self-employment taxes owed by the Amish, who object on religious grounds to paying social security assessments.*

*The first block of 10 horses will be sold at auction in Canton on October 17 unless their owners redeem them by 9:00 a.m. that date, according to Melvin J. Burton, district director of internal revenue here. Board, transportation and other costs will be added to the tax liens, which range from \$25 to \$150.*

On November 2, 1958, the *Indianapolis Times* published the following feature article entitled, "Twilight For the Dissenter:"

*Over in Wayne County, Ohio, last week end they were holding a horse auction.*

*The horses on sale were not the usual fancy show stock or the racing or saddle type common to such auctions.*

*These were sleek, heavy, slow-footed farm horses, built to pull a plow.*

*They belonged to Amish farmers, of whom a considerable colony has lived quietly and peaceably in that neighborhood for the past 100 years and more, and a few of them, conspicuous in their broad-brimmed black hats and luxuriant beards, stood about silently watching their horses sold. They were not, to be sure, selling their own horses.*

*The Government of the United States was doing that.*



It had seized these plow-horses off these Amish farms with all the majesty of the Law behind it and the power, if it had been needed, of all our armed forces to back it up, to satisfy a "claim" against the owners. These Amish farmers, because of religious scruples against it, had not made their "social security" payments. It was all quite legal — or, anyway, nearly all.

As the sale began a young Oberlin College student turned up wearing on his back a crudely hand-lettered sign that read, "if Government can take these horses today it could take yours tomorrow — Don't Bid."

He had hardly walked a dozen steps before two burly sheriff's deputies grabbed him and hustled him off to their car. The Gestapo couldn't have done it more efficiently. The sale went on.

The Amish farmers cling to a simple and somewhat primitive faith that forbids them to accept anything they have not honestly earned. That includes the so-called "insurance" or "old age assistance" or "retirement benefits" of social security, along with any other kind of charity, gift, subsidy or "welfare" handout of any kind whatever from government. They provide for their own old age by lifetimes of hard work and thrift. They help one another when misfortune strikes as a normal act of brotherly obligation. They consider it, indeed, deeply immoral to get something for nothing.

There was a time, and not so long ago, when nearly

all Americans felt the same way about such things.

But the Congress in its last session amended the social security laws to extend — as some Congressmen have since declared with pride — what they call its "protection" to some millions of individuals not previously covered by it — whether they wanted it or not. A good many did not, it appears, and some minority groups, such as, I believe, lawyers, managed to get themselves exempted from some of that, but these Amish farmers, of course, had no lobby in Washington to do that for them. So they now are compelled by law to take part in a program they conscientiously believe is immoral and wrong. When they did not pay up the Government simply took away from them the horses they must have to support their families now in order that the Government may support them at some future time.

What the federal agents were doing was in strict compliance with the letter of the law. By its terms, any property of anyone who doesn't make his social security payments as ordered can be similarly seized and sold. There is no choice about it, and no consideration given to anyone who for whatever reason may not want this "Security."

Here in Indiana we have lately watched the unrelenting attempts of federal agents to confiscate the tractors of an Indiana farmer to punish him for growing — on his own land, by his own labor and for his own use — somewhat more grain than a federal bureau had decided he should grow. Nor is his an un-

---

If you do not keep a permanent file of *The Dan Smoot Report*, please mail this copy to a friend who is interested in sound government.

---

DAN SMOOT,  
P. O. Box 9611, Lakewood Station  
Dallas 14, Texas

Please enter my subscription for (\_\_\_\_\_ years) (\_\_\_\_\_ months) to THE DAN SMOOT REPORT. I enclose \$\_\_\_\_\_; please bill me for\_\_\_\_\_.

Rates: \$10 for 1 year
\$ 6 for six months
\$ 3 for three months
\$12 first class mail
\$14 for air mail
\$18 for 2 years

\_\_\_\_\_  
PRINT NAME

\_\_\_\_\_  
STREET ADDRESS

\_\_\_\_\_  
CITY AND STATE

usual case. All over this country "fines" have been levied, and in general meekly paid without battle or even the formality of a "trial" for this "offense" against the nation.

There are, indeed, few — and year by year fewer — areas of individual life or activity into which federal regulation has not already encroached. Government now regulates jobs, the relations between employer and employee, the affairs of the unions of workers, the most minute details of farming and broad areas of business operations. It has undertaken responsibility for employment and wages and working hours and limited incomes and inheritances. It has gone so far into intimate domestic affairs as to reward large families and penalize small ones. After first making it increasingly difficult for any individual to accumulate savings to support him in his old age it now has taken over that function, after a fashion, for most of the people of the United States. It requires — and collects in the form of taxes — on the average more than 10 hours of labor from every worker every week out of the normal 40 hours it has itself decreed by statute is a proper working week. All of this vast levy and more, it either gives away as grants, subsidies, and gifts or spends on the distribution of these handouts.

All this, of course, has been accomplished one little step at a time.

Not even the most vacuous planner ever was foolish enough to offer a whole program of such scope as the one now in operation for approval of the people of this country.

On the contrary, each advance along the route was a small one, usually made possible by a gift or the

promise of something for nothing dangled before one minority group after another like a carrot on a stick. It functions now mainly by a system of rewards and penalties.

An Amish who prefers to support himself by his own efforts rather than to get cash from his government sees his property sold at auction. A Hoosier farmer who wants to grow enough corn to feed his chickens is fined and hectorred. Those who surrender their right to decide their own affairs for themselves find it temporarily profitable... those who dissent find it costly.

Nor is the program anywhere near its goal.

Every year additions and "improvements" to it are proposed — there are dozens pending right now — every one offering something to somebody, every one demanding the surrender of a little more of the freedom of the individual American citizen and the grant of a little more power to Government over people.

There is, indeed, getting to be less and less room for dissenters in this country.

There could come — and in this direction there will come — a time when there is no room left for them at all. No more, for instance, than there was for the college student at that horse auction when the deputy sheriffs grabbed him.

No government ever has long survived the attainment of any such power. . . .

Even in America there could come a November when there no longer would be an election day.

## WHO IS DAN SMOOT?

Dan Smoot was born in Missouri. Reared in Texas, he attended SMU in Dallas, taking BA and MA degrees from that university in 1938 and 1940.

In 1941, he joined the faculty at Harvard as a Teaching Fellow in English, doing graduate work for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the field of American Civilization.

In 1942, he took leave of absence from Harvard in order to join the FBI. At the close of the war, he stayed in the FBI, rather than return to Harvard.

He served as an FBI Agent in all parts of the nation, handling all kinds of assignments. But for three and a half years, he worked exclusively on communist investigations in the industrial midwest. For two years following that, he was on FBI headquarters staff in Washington, as an Administrative Assistant to J. Edgar Hoover.

After nine and a half years in the FBI, Smoot resigned to help start the Facts Forum movement in Dallas. As the radio and television commentator for Facts Forum, Smoot, for almost four years spoke to a national audience giving both sides of great controversial issues.

In July, 1955, he resigned and started his own independent program, in order to give only one side — the side that uses fundamental American principles as a yardstick for measuring all important issues.

If you believe that Dan Smoot is providing effective tools for those who want to think and talk and write on the side of freedom, you can help immensely by subscribing, and encouraging others to subscribe, to *The Dan Smoot Report*.



om  
ick  
and

bi  
ern  
sie  
bi  
de  
ve  
ent

are  
—  
one  
ee-  
ant

for

vill  
em  
the  
uty

in-

ber